



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/752,068	03/02/2001	Michael J. Ramadei	F-166	7731
7590 08/23/2004			EXAMINER	
Pitney Bowes Inc. Intellectual Property and Technology Law Departmen 35 Waterview Drive, P.O. Box 3000 Shelton, CT 06484-8000			MASKULINSKI, MICHAEL C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2113	
			DATE MAILED: 08/23/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

A	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/752,068	RAMADEI ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael C Maskulinski	2113
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 09 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearamentation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applic  i) a timely filed amendment whi  al (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in
	<u>PLY</u> [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleaned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>09 August 2004</u> . A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		
2. $\square$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:	
(a) \( \square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	(see NOTE below);
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);	
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: <u>The</u>		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 8,10 and 11.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-7,9,12 a	<u>nd 13</u> .	
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	
10.⊠ Other: see attached paper no. 2	700	
Best A	vailable Conv	

Art Unit: 2113

## **Grounds for Rejection**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 8, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuyama et al., U.S. Patent 5,596,712, and further in view of Tatosian et al., U.S. Patent 5,956,352.

ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100